

## **MINUTES**

Mayor's Advisory Committee – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan  
Amazon Community Center – 2700 Hilyard Street

May 5, 2004  
7 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Nancy Nathanson, Chair; Dale Berg, Merle Bottge, Corey Dingman, Art Farley, Steve Johnson, Terry Leary, Avishai Schermerhorn, Linda Swisher, Tim Whitley, Members; Scott Duckett, Angel Jones, Johnny Medlin, Andreo Riner, Carrie Peterson, Staff.

### **I. WELCOME**

#### **Update on PROS Committee request to Council**

Ms. Nathanson convened the meeting at 7 pm.

Ms. Nathanson said the meeting packet contained the comments made by the City Council as well as the material distributed to the council members.

Call attention to “Sequencing of Financial Measures”, Ms. Nathanson said attachment b. in the document showed a summary of Eugene Property Tax Election Results.

Ms. Nathanson noted that Schools Local Option Levy was expiring and was up for renewal. She outlined the tentative election schedule shown in Attachment c.

Calling attention to the Executive Summary of the Multi-year financial plan, Ms. Nathanson commented that the upcoming fiscal year would maintain services but noted that this did not mean there would be no cuts. She said some programs would have to be cut to maintain public safety and operations and maintenance.

Johnny Medlin said the multi-year financial plan contained the things necessary to maintain the City's asset base. He said staff could be expected to work towards the goal of maintaining/redeveloping the asset base.

Ms. Nathanson said the previous year there had been a proposal to close Echo Hollow Pool which she and Councilor Solomon had worked to turn that decision around. She said Echo Hollow Pool could not be penalized for not bringing in the same amount of revenue as Amazon Pool. She said capital investments were sometimes needed to help improve revenue from City facilities.

Mr. Farley said there was a subcommittee working on making a presentation to the Council. He said there were ideas around a bond levy and an interim bond measure to help get funding. He said there was hope that the Council would make the issue a work item.

Ms. Nathanson said the creation of special districts did not necessarily mean anything could be funded. She noted that Ballot Measure 5 had put limitations on the quantity of taxes that could be assessed.

Mr. Johnson said the composition of a ballot measure made all the difference.. He said the positive results from the last measure could show the benefits that could be achieved. He stressed the importance of the City Council understanding maintenance costs that went along with new parks facilities.

Ms. Nathanson called for brief comments from the rest of the committee.

Mr. Schermerhorn said there was not much to lose by a bond measure even if it failed. He said it would help keep the issue in the forefront of peoples minds.

Mr. Berg raised concern over putting the matter on the ballot. He said the preparation was not ready.

Mr. Dingman agreed and said people needed to know what they were voting for. He said he did not believe that a bond measure for just land acquisition would pass.

Mr. Whitley stressed the importance of working fast while land was still available.

In response to a question from Mr. Schermerhorn regarding the reasoning for waiting to put the matter on the ballot, Ms. Riner said work on the plan remained to be completed. She said her intent was to have the work done by November.

Ms. Nathanson called for a binder of all public comment and committee findings that could be placed in the City Council office so councilors could review the material. She also suggested expanding the quarterly update somewhat.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

## **III. MEETING MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL**

Ms. Bottge, seconded by Mr. Farley moved to approve the minutes of April 7, January 7, 2004, and October 2002. The motion passed unanimously.

## **IV. PROS COMP PLAN UPDATE**

Ms. Riner said there was a committee reviewing SDC methodology which was looking to the PROS committee to finish its work before they could make final recommendations. She noted that the only people paying new SDC charges were those building new homes and apartments. She said that the idea of including commercial development in new SDC assessments was being discussed. She said that a survey was being planned to gain information on who was using parks.

In response to a question from Ms Nathanson regarding what the average SDC charge was for a new residential home, Ms. Riner said it was approximately \$1,300. She said this was included in the building permit fee.

Ms. Nathanson noted that there was always in the development community because of balancing SDCs and keeping housing affordable.

Ms. Bottge said there was a new law that SDCs needed to be on the capital improvement list to show how the needs of growth and population were being met.

## **V. STRATEGIES 1: Parks, Community Facilities, Natural Areas**

### **Continued Review of Needs Assessment Findings/Recommendations in the Parks and Open Space Analysis Report**

Ms. Riner said the only portion of the analysis was proposed standards for neighborhood parks, community parks, natural area parks, and other parklands. She said the other things were a needs assessment.

Ms. Bottge said it would be helpful to include what the estimated population would be in 2025 since that was what the analysis was supposed to predict.

Ms. Riner said questions around urban plazas and linear parks were critical. She distributed fact sheets with parks photos as examples to members.

Mr. Schermerhorn questioned whether private plazas were included in the needs assessment, Ms. McIntyre said private plazas were not included in the needs assessment.

Ms. Nathanson said she had discussed the idea of creating an urban plaza in front of North Eugene High School. She said the principal had been in favor of the idea.

Ms. Bottge said the Amazon Creek Trail could be an example of a linear park.

There was general consensus to include the example photos in the final recommendations.

Ms. Nathanson asked for input on whether the analysis of phase 2 was acceptable to the committee.

Ms. Bottge said soccer fields could be used for other purposes.

Ms. Riner said those other purposes had been factored into the analysis.

Mr. Johnson suggested facilities for bike racing and inline skating. He stressed the importance of including things that were not currently in the City.

Ms. Nathanson stressed the importance of adding themes in public comment in the final analysis.

Mr. Whitley said a lot of the public comment had expressed interest in environmental education.

Mr. Johnson commented that all activities could not be captured. He said running trails could also be mentioned as outdoor recreation activities.

Ms. Nathanson said that open areas for all kinds of other activities needed to be included as well. Ms. Riner added that there needed to be multiple areas of that sort.

Ms. Nathanson called for comments on natural area amenities.

Mr. Farley suggested wildlife viewing areas were needed.

Mr. Schermerhorn commented that there needed to be a better definition of interpretive facilities.

Mr. Whitely reiterated the need for environmental education for the community. He suggested that the West Eugene Wetlands Education Center could fill that need.

In response to a question from Ms. Swisher regarding the definition of a trailhead, Ms. Riner said it was a support facility for trail used that could include parking, restrooms, picnic facilities, etc.

Ms. Swisher said trails for passive walking were needed. She said there were a lot of senior citizens who no longer traveled to the mountains but still enjoy walks locally.

Ms. Nathanson called for ideas on recreational facilities.

Ms. Nathanson suggested that easements or rights-of-way that could be used by the general public. She suggested a way of acknowledging those paths in a way that did not alarm property owners.

Mr. Farley suggested marked ways from one park to another through city streets. He stressed the importance of connectivity.

Mr. Schermerhorn raised concern that adding more community centers might cause existing facilities to lose business.

Ms. McIntyre said the plan called for such facilities in areas where one did not exist.

Ms. Riner said Eugene had no major community centers. She said Eugene's facilities were considered substandard for meeting all community needs.

Mr. Johnson noted that Eugene had no track and field facilities that were not affiliated with schools. He added that more swimming pools would be needed by 2025.

### **Community Design Forum Findings**

No Action.

### **Set up for June Meeting and Discussion**

Ms. Riner said she was planning the next meetings. She called for input from the committee on who could attend a July and August meeting. She noted that there would not be a meeting on June 2. There was general consensus to hold the meeting on June 9.

Ms. Riner said the next meeting would focus on building strategies for parks and open space facilities. She suggested three small planning groups working on the findings from the public forum as well as future needs for community and neighborhood parks. She said the groups could work on what facilities would work in what locations and what partners could be enlisted to work with the City on urban plazas. She expressed a hope that as much as possible might be accomplished at the June meeting.

## **VI. CLOSE**

Mr. Whitley noted that it was wetlands month and many activities were planned in the West Eugene Wetlands.

Ms. Nathanson said staff would send out messages to the members to finalize the date for the June meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9 pm.

(Recorded by Joe Sams)

*C:\User\ccIGR030212.wpd*